

**REMARKS**

Prior to entry of this paper, Claims 1-38 were pending. Claims 1-38 were rejected. In this paper, Claims 1, 11, 17, 27, and 34 are amended; Claims 41-44 are added; no claims are cancelled. Claims 1-38 and 41-44 are currently pending. No new matter is added by way of this amendment. For at least the following reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that each of the presently pending claims is in condition for allowance.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, 17-24, 26, 34, 37-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Madnick et al. (US 5,913,214) in view of Lizuka et al. (US 6,424,980) and Bates et al. (US 6,873,982). Claims 4, 35, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Madnick et al. (US 5,913,214) in view of Lizuka et al. (US 6,424,980) and Bates et al. (US 6,873,982) and further in view of Hennings et al. (US 6,763,496). Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Madnick et al. (US 5,913,214) in view of Lizuka et al. (US 6,424,980) and Bates et al. (US 6,873,982) and further in view of Jammes et al. (US 6,484,149). Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Madnick et al. (US 5,913,214) in view of Lizuka et al. (US 6,424,980) and Bates et al. (US 6,873,982) and further in view of Jammes et al. (US 6,484,149) and Christianson et al. (US 6,085,186). Claims 11-13, 15-16, 27-28, and 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Madnick et al. (US 5,913,214) in view of Bates et al. (US 6,873,982). Claims 14, 25, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Madnick et al. (US 5,913,214) in view of Bates et al. (US 6,873,982) and further in view of Hennings et al. (US 6,763,496). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Regarding amended Claim 1, Applicant holds that the combination of Madnick, Lizuka, and Bates does not render obvious all the claimed limitations. For example, none of the prior art references teach providing *the extracted data from the determined web domain address* in a data log directly to the user, as claimed, in part, by at least amended Claim 1. Applicant agrees with the Examiner that Madnick does not teach this limitation. However, Applicant disagrees that Bates

teaches or suggests this limitation. Instead, Bates discloses constructing “one or more HTML documents for the results … typically include[ing] a subset of the results, often broken into a predetermined number of results.” See Bates, column 12, lines 17-22. Further, Table 1 of Bates (column 11) shows an example HTML result document. Here, Bates appears to teach that the results are typically URLs: “<A HREF = http://www.aFirstLinkToTake.com> A first link to take</A><BR></BR><A HREF = http://www.aSecondLinkToTake.com> A second link to take</A>.” Bates does not appear to teach or suggest providing *extracted data* from the determined web domain address in Bates’ HTML result document, but rather providing URL links to other web domain addresses. Further, Lizuka does not cure this defect. Therefore, the prior art references (the combination of which the Applicant denies) does not render obvious at least amended Claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 11, 17, 27, and 34 have been amended in similar, albeit different, ways as Claim 1 and are thus allowable over the prior art references for similar reasons to amended Claim 1. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of Claims 1, 11, 17, 27, and 34 be withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 4, Applicant holds that there is no motivation to combine Hennings with Madnick. Madnick is directed to a system for querying data sources over a network. Hennings is directed to displaying contextual information relating to hyperlinks on a webpage containing hyperlinks, providing a user with additional information. Specifically, Madnick is described as allowing “semi-structured data sources to be queried using a structured query language … Data is extracted from the semi-structured data source and returned to the requester.” See Madnick, column 2, lines 28-41. Hennings describes that “it would be advantageous for a user to be able to view contextual information concerning a linked document or other resource, such as its size, recent edits, etc, so that the user can decide whether to view the document before selecting the link.” See Hennings, column 7, lines 24-28.

However, in Madnick, a query is performed on a semi-structured data source over a network by a *system*. When taking prior art references as a whole, the modification of adding contextual information to a system for performing queries would change the principle of operation of Madnick,

which is impermissible. See MPEP 2143.01 VI. One of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine contextual information relating to hyperlinks on a webpage intended to provide additional information *to a user* to a *system* for querying semi-structured data sources. Thus, Applicant holds that it is improper to combine Hennings with Madnick. As such, none of the prior art references teach or suggest the limitation of following links contained within the web domain until the links have been exhausted or following the links until a predetermined limit is reached, as claimed, in part, by at least Claim 4. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 14, 25, and 36 contain similar, albeit different, limitations as Claim 4 and are thus allowable over the prior art references for similar reasons to Claim 4. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of Claims 4, 14, 25, and 36 be withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 44, Applicant holds that none of the prior art references, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest storing the database-structured query nor providing a stored database-structured query to the client computer system upon user input request, as claimed, in part, by Claim 44. Bates teaches that a unique identifier is generated for each search and an entry is added “to the search request staging table including the generated ID and the search words provided with the search request.” See Bates, column 12, lines 7-11. However, Bates appears to teach using the stored results internally for expediting the return of search results. See Bates, column 15, lines 1-2. Thus, Bates does not teach or suggest providing the search request upon user request. Further, none of the other prior art references cure this defect. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 44 is allowable over the prior art references.

Regarding Claim 41, Applicant holds that none of the prior art references, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest the at least one fundamental clause including a request to parse an HTML table, and wherein extracting the data further comprises extracting data from the HTML table, as claimed, in part, by Claim 41. The office action alleges that fundamental clauses are rendered obvious by Iizuka. However, Iizuka teaches “a search request (query statement) consist[s] of search items and search conditions entered by a user.” See Iizuka, column 13, lines 35-37. The

“HTML processing unit 134 ... filters the selected information pieces according to the search conditions.” See Iizuka, column 13, lines 53-54. Iizuka does not appear to teach or suggest using the search condition to parse an HTML table nor extract data from the HTML data. Further, none of the other prior art references cure this defect. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 41 is allowable over the prior art references.

Regarding Claim 42, Applicant holds that none of the prior art references, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest providing authentication data to the web domain, as claimed, in part, by Claim 42. Further, regarding Claim 43, Applicant holds that none of the prior art references, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest the extracted data including at least one binary file, as claimed, in part, by Claim 43. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 42-43 are allowable over the prior art references.

Further, dependent Claims 2-10, 12-16, 18-26, 28-33, and 35-44 are at least allowable for the same reasons as amended independent Claims 1, 11, 17, 27, and 34 upon which they depend respectively. Thus, the rejection of these claims is now moot. Claims 1-44 are therefore not anticipated nor rendered obvious and are in condition for allowance over the prior art references.

**CONCLUSION**

It is respectfully submitted that each of the presently pending claims (Claims 1-38 and 41-44) is in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is requested. Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's representative at the below-listed telephone number if it is believed that the prosecution of this application may be assisted thereby. Although only certain arguments regarding patentability are set forth herein, there may be other arguments and reasons why the claimed invention is patentable. Applicant reserves the right to raise these arguments in the future.

Dated: April 6, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By \_\_\_\_\_

John W. Branch

Registration No.: 41,633

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(206) 262-8906

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant